



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/630,922	07/31/2003	Kyung-geun Lee	1293.1952	7580
49455	7590 04/13/2006		EXAMINER	
STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP 1400 EYE STREET, NW			HINDI, NABIL Z	
SUITE 300	IREEI, NW		. ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGT	ON, DC 20005		2627	-
			DATE MAILED: 04/13/2000	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Ameliandian Na		
	Application No.	Application No. Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summan	10/630,922	LEE ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	NABIL Z. HINDI	2627	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	B DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a r riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON atute, cause the application to become AR	CATION. eply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communicatio	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _			
3) Since this application is in condition for allo		are procedution as to the movite i	_
closed in accordance with the practice unde			S
	si Ex parte Quayle, 1900 C.D	, 11, 400 O.G. 210.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/are pending in the applicati	ion.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without	drawn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam	iner		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a		av the Evaminer	
Applicant may not request that any objection to t			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr			٦/
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the			a).
	Liverimer. Note the attached	Office Action of form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•		
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 	ents have been received.		
 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the p 	riority documents have been		
application from the International Burn			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a l	ist of the certified copies not	eceived.	
Mark marks			
Attachment(s)	🗖		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		ummary (PTO-413) /Mail Date	
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/I Paper No(s)/Mail Date	08) 5) Notice of In 6) Other:	formal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Page 2

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hamada et al (6400665)

The reference shows an optical disk recording apparatus comprising a pickup 2 for reading and writing data onto a disk and a system controller 13 that records write protection status data on the disk including the write protected data area size. The status data are recorded into a plurality of different locations indicating one of more than a plurality of status data as cited in fig 7 meeting the claimed invention.

With respect to the limitations of claims 2 and 8. The reference in fig 7 indicated different data being recorded on the disk indicating the size, the location, volume data ...etc (fig 8).

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ko et al (6724705).

Page 3

The reference shows an optical disk reading and recording apparatus having a pickup for writing data and a system controller for writing a plurality of write protection data statuses on the disk, wherein one of the statuses allow defective management on the disk as cited in columns 5 and 6 with respect to figs 4a, 4b, 5a and 5b.

With respect to the limitations of claims 12-14. the claims read on defect management within the DMA areas of the disk as shows in figs 2, 10 and 13.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-6, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada et al in view of Ko e al.

The primary reference discloses the invention as analyzed above. However the reference does not disclose the use of an inner and outer spare area for defective management. The secondary reference in figs 2, 10 and 13 discloses the use of a spare area on the disk for the purpose of defective management on the disk. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teachings of the secondary reference and modify the system of the primary reference. Such modification of using a DMA areas within the lead in and lead out area of a disk is notoriously well established in the art as evidence from applicant's own prior art for the purpose of data defective management thereon. Thus one of ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 2627

the art would have been motivated to use the teachings of the secondary reference for the purpose of continuous data recording during interruption and defects thereon.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985): *In re Van Omum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1962), *In re Vogei*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-14 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of U.S. Patent No. 6,862,256.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims in the present applicant are broader and included within the claimed limitations of the Patent.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to NABIL Z. HINDI at telephone number (571) 272-7618.

RHMARY EXAMINER GROUP BUGG 7